IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE OF
ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.1354 OF 2007

Dated : February 1, 2007

Between:

K.Chandrasekhar

Petitioner

AND

The Superintendent of Police,
Nizamabad District at Nizamabad and others

Respondents

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA
AND
THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.LAKSHMANA REDDY

TAKEN UP WRIT PETITION NO.1354 OF 2007

ORAL ORDER: **(per THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE D.S.R.VARMA)**

Heard the learned Government Pleader for Home, representing the learned Advocate General, appearing for the respondents.

2. This writ petition is taken up on the basis of a telegram, dated 16.01.2007, addressed by one K.Chandrasekhar, H.No.1-1-668, Padmanagar, Road No.3, Nizamabad, to the Hon'ble the Chief Justice, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, alleging that his brother by name Kyatham Rajasekhar, S/o.

Sudershan, aged about 23 years, occupation: Executive, was missing since three months and that despite lodging of a complaint with the IV Town Police Station on 13.11.2006, which was registered as Cr.No.190 of 2006, under the head 'Man Missing', the police did not take any action so far.

3. Pursuant to the notice, issued by this Court, the Sub-Inspector of Police, IV Town Police Station, Nizamabad, filed counter-affidavit stating, *inter alia*, that during the course of investigation, he examined five witnesses and also recorded their statements; that paper publication was also issued in the vernacular Telugu daily newspapers; that wide publicity through electronic media was also given and that further efforts are being continued to trace out the missing person.

4. In the counter-affidavit, various other steps that were taken by the police in order to trace out the missing person are also narrated. We feel that there is no need to reiterate all those particulars and suffice it to express our opinion that the steps taken by the police are reasonable.

5. It is further stated in the counter-affidavit that during the course of investigation, the petitioner had approached the IV Town Police Station on 20.11.2006 and furnished E-mail information received by him from his missing brother on 7.11.2006 and 8.11.2006, wherein it was stated that the Company Authorities, under whom the missing person was working, have found fault with the missing person and made him responsible for the loss sustained by the customers; that as per the said E-mail, it is clear that the missing person, on his own volition, disappeared and has been hiding at unknown places, since he was found fault by his employee and that the alleged E-mails, sent by the

missing person to the petitioner, are also enclosed to the counter-affidavit.

6. Under these circumstances, we are of the view that, in all probability, the missing person Mr. Kyatham Rajasekhar, had disappeared intentionally. However, suffice it to close the writ petition with a direction to the Superintendent of Police, Nizamabad, to monitor the investigation and report to the Registrar (Judicial) of this Court, as and when the missing person is traced.

7. With the above direction, the writ petition is closed, at the stage of admission. However, there shall be no order as to costs.

_____

D.S.R.Varma, J.

_____

P.Lakshmana Reddy, J.

01ST FEBRUARY 2007

MAS/KRK